



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,172	07/13/2001	David S. Mui	004227 USA	2748
32588	7590	07/02/2004	02/ETCH/SILICO	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			EXAMINER DEO. DUY VU NGUYEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/905,172	Applicant(s) MUI ET AL.	
	Examiner DuyVu n Deo	Art Unit 1765	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11, 13-40.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

JD

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Referring to applicant's argument that the office action does not explain why one skill in the art would be motivated to select this particular material for use in Huang, as opposed to the myriad other low k dielectric constant organic layers known in the art, one skill in the art can use other low k dielectric organic layers too. As shown by Huang, any low k dielectric can be used including this low k dielectric organic material from Hasegawa.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 44 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Hasegawa does suggest PECVD (col. 9, line 9). Any process that is available to one skill in the art, including PECVD, for depositing organic layer, would be obvious.

Referring to applicant's argument that a layer useful as an interlayer insulating material would by no means provide a reasonable expectation that the same material can be successfully employed as a masking layer, this does not respond to the rejection because it is combined not as a masking layer. Furthermore, the low k organic layer is not a masking layer in the claims but a part of a multiplayer structure that called masking structure by the applicant. It is obvious that any structure that has the same layers would also read on claimed masking structure.

Referring to applicant's argument that the office action motivation of adding the low k material from Hasegawa is an suggestion of "obvious to try" of using one of the low k dielectric layer taught in Hasegawa as an masking layer as taught in Huang. First, there is no obvious to try. Huang does teach using a low k organic material and the layer taught by Hasegawa is a low k organic material. Therefore, it would be used with an expectation of success. Second, the low k organic material is not combined as a masking layer but Hasegawa further shows the specific organic material that is silent in Huang..